2
F.Q.
1.0
1.1
1.25
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
2.2
2.5
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 538 SO 013 562

AUTHOR Jensen, Eric L.; Webster, David
TITLE Ranking Studies of Graduate Sociology Departments in "The American Sociologist": 1965-1980.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Departments; Faculty; *Graduate School Faculty; Higher Education; *Intellectual Disciplines; Literature Reviews; Scholarly Journals; *Sociology; Tables (Data); Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Ranking

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews ranking studies of graduate level college and university departments of sociology in "The American Sociologist" from its inception in 1965 through 1980. "The American Sociologist" was selected as the source of ranking studies because of its function "as an organ of information and discussion for the professional concerns of sociologists as a social collectivity," and, specifically, because it has presented a large number of articles on prestige within the discipline. Studies reviewed in the paper are limited to those which deal with the prestige or quality rankings of departments, the changing methods of ranking studies in sociology, divergent results of the various methodologies used in the ratings, and mobility of departments over time. Most of the studies date from 1965 through 1975 because editorial policy during this period favored rating studies whereas editorial policy after this time discouraged them. Ranking studies discussed include four which rate the faculty of graduate sociology department b total productivity (Knudsen-Vaughan, 1969; Glenn-Villemez, 1970; Oromaner, 1972; and Doering, 1972), and four which rate graduates by total productivity (Wanderer, 1966; Knudsen-Vaughn, 1969; Larson, Petronsky, and Vandiver, 1972; and Sturgis and Clemente, 1973). Findings from analysis of tabular and expository departmental rating data indicate that there exists a generally agreed-upon elite among graduate sociology depatments (Harvard, UC Berkeley, Columbia, Chicago, and Michigan), editors of prestigious journals tend to be concentrated in these same elite departments, and the status of the institution is often a good predictor of departmental prestige. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED206538

Ranking Studies of Graduate Sociology Departments in *The American Sociologist*: 1965-1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ERIC L JENSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Eric L. Jensen

Department of Sociology/Anthropology

University of Idaho

and

David Webster

Graduate School of Education

University of California, Los Angeles

SO 013 562

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April 13-17, 1981

The objective of this paper is to review the ranking studies of graduate departments of sociology in *The American Sociologist* from its inception in 1965 through 1980. The studies reviewed in this paper will be limited to those which explicitly rank graduate departments or critique methods of rating departments. That is, we will review studies which deal with the prestige or quality rankings of departments but will exclude those articles concerned with other dimensions of prestige such as regional productivity rates, variations in time spent obtaining the Ph.D. by prestige of department, studies of faculty promotion in various departments, etc. Throughout this review we will discuss studies which assess the changing methods of ranking studies in sociology, the divergent results of the various methodologies used in the ratings, and the mobility of departments over time.

The American Sociologist was chosen for the source of ranking sources because it is the navel-gazing journal of the profession. In the words of its first editor Talcott Parsons, *TAS* was initiated to serve " . . . as an organ of information and discussion for the professional concerns of sociologists as a social collectivity" (Parsons 1965:2-3). With such a focus for the journal and the impetus provided by the American Council on Education studies, articles on prestige within the discipline flourished in *TAS* until 1976.

In an interesting turn of events, beginning with a change in editors and editorial policy in 1976 *TAS* discontinued publishing ranking studies. The new editor Allen Grimshaw stated, " . . . I want to declare a moratorium on introspective self-analysis of the stratification system of the discipline" (Grimshaw 1975:192). Unfortunately for the purposes of this study, Grimshaw did not clearly explain his reasons for eliminating

this topic from the pages of *TAS*. Subsequent editors have continued this policy.

The factors influencing this editorial decision are open to speculation. Given the volume of prestige related articles in *TAS* it is possible that sociologists had reached their threshold of rating studies. This change in editorial policy is also curiously related to the changing employment market for sociologists. By 1976 sociology had entered a depressed academic job market. During the late 1960s and the early 1970s sociologists shared in the benefits of the great expansion in American higher education. Rating studies reached their peak of visibility in the professional journals at that time, especially in *TAS*. With the downturn in the academic marketplace in the mid 1970s from which we have not yet arisen, the number of rating studies has diminished greatly. Thus, the possibility of a relationship between the burgeoning academic marketplace and the increase in rating studies, on the one hand, and the onset of a depressed market for sociologists and the diminished interest in prestige studies in the sociology of sociology, on the other hand, seems clear. We speculate that when the job market is tight the importance of prestige in academic careers is lessened for many sociologists due to the grim realities of obtaining employment.

Thus our study of the ratings of graduate sociology departments is limited to the period 1965 through 1975. While this is a limitation inherent with *TAS* as the sole source of data for this research, it is also indicative of a dwindling interest in this aspect of the sociology of sociology since the mid 1970s.

The ACE Studies

Before reviewing the rating studies in *TAS*, it is necessary to set the stage by briefly discussing the two most influential such studies outside the domain of *TAS*. The American Council on Education commissioned Allan Cartter to conduct a national study of the quality of graduate education in 29 disciplines and 106 institutions. The Cartter study was published in 1966. ACE later commissioned Kenneth Roose and Charles Andersen to conduct a five-year follow-up of the Cartter study. The Roose-Anderson (1970) study was expanded to cover 36 disciplines and 131 institutions (Lawrence and Green 1980).

Both the Cartter and the Roose-Andersen studies used the reputational approach to rating graduate departments. Their methodology was to survey a sample of departmental chairpersons, distinguished senior scholars, and knowledgeable junior scholars in the disciplines under study to rank graduate departments according to the quality of graduate faculty and the effectiveness of doctoral programs (Lawrence and Green 1980). Table 1 presents the rankings of the top ten graduate sociology departments according to Cartter and Roose-Anderson.

As would be anticipated, the ACE studies generated a great deal of response. The rankings of sociology departments are of course no exception to this pattern. As we will see in the following literature review, many of the ranking studies in *TAS* are either in reaction to the ACE studies or attempts to test the reputational method with quantifiable indicators of quality.

Since the study of the prestige or quality of graduate programs parallels one of the central issues in social stratification (i.e.,

measuring socioeconomic status), we see a great deal of the studies in *TAS* attempting to test the reputational methods of ACE with more objective measures such as research productivity of faculty or of doctoral graduates. That is, with the increasingly emphasis of sociological research as a whole on quantification and the related movement away from subjective measures of socioeconomic status in the stratification literature, many of the studies reviewed in this paper focus on the congruity of reputational and objective measures of the quality of graduate education in sociology.

A Review of Rating Studies in the American Sociologist

Wanderer (1966) was the first ranking of sociology departments to appear in *The American Sociologist*. In this study Wanderer counts the number of articles, research reports, and notes per department where the author obtained the doctorate in *American Sociological Review* during the period 1955-65. *ASR* is used as the sole source of publication data since it is the most prestigious sociology journal. He presents a listing of 21 schools which are ranked among the top 10 in contributions to *ASR* in any one of the eleven years. Wanderer concludes that Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, and Michigan are the overall top four departments (see Table 2). He also found that these top four departments are overrepresented in *ASR* publications compared to the number of doctorates they granted. With the Wanderer study we see the beginnings of the dominance of quantitative quality ranking studies in *TAS*.

Lewis's (1968) research is in reaction to the Cartter study. Lewis is concerned about the relationship of Cartter's findings based on the reputational method with an objective ranking of departments. The top 17

departments according to Cartter are ranked in this study by the quantity of articles, research reports and notes, and extended commentaries published by faculty and graduates in *ASR* between 1956 and 1965. Lewis finds a close agreement between reputational rankings and productivity rankings for some departments (i.e., Berkeley, Chicago, Harvard, Wisconsin and North Carolina) but large inconsistencies for other departments (i.e., Michigan, Cornell, Princeton, Minnesota, Northwestern, Yale, and Washington U.). These discrepancies between prestige and productivity are often related to the number of doctorates granted at each institution. Lewis concludes, "Regardless of objective quality, it is mostly a department's prestige that has meaning on the wider academic scene, this surely determines a school's attractiveness to promising and potentially productive graduate students, neophyte scholars, and those who dispense research and training grants" (p. 131).

Knudsen and Vaughan (1969) also address the issue of the correspondence between subjective and objective indicators of quality in graduate education in sociology. Like Lewis (1968) this study was stimulated by the Cartter research. Knudsen and Vaughan used all articles in *ASR*, *The American Journal of Sociology*, and *Social Forces* plus the research notes and book reviews in *ASR* for the five year period 1960 through 1964 as their data base. The authors were identified as to the institution at which they were employed at the time of the publication and the source of their highest degree. A weighting system was devised to reflect the varying degrees of prestige related to different scholarly works. Without discussing this system in detail, scholarly contributions were weighted in the following rank order: theoretical or research monographs, textbooks, an edited collection or an article in *ASR*, an article in *AJS*, an article in *SF*, a research note in *ASR*. Size of the

department's faculty and doctorates granted were controlled by using the number of publications per capita.

Knudsen and Vaughan conclude that the relationship between Cartter's reputational rankings and their productivity based measures of quality is strong only for the elite departments (i.e., Harvard, Berkeley, Chicago, and Michigan). They find substantial discrepancies between the rankings based on subjective and objective methods for departments below these few top schools. Again size of faculty and number of Ph.D.s granted were found to be related to the findings of Cartter's study. That is, rankings based on the absolute number of scholarly works per department are similar to those found with the subjective method (see Table 2). Rankings based on per capita productivity show considerable discrepancies with the reputational rankings of departments below the elite few, however (see Table 3). Thus, according to Knudsen and Vaughan, the subjective and objective methods of assessing quality of graduate education in sociology are in agreement on the elite departments but present wide discrepancies on the rankings of the remainder of Ph.D. granting departments.

Shamblin (1970) critiques the Knudsen-Vaughan study. Shamblin argues that Knudsen and Vaughan are not measuring quality as they claim but given their methodology are measuring prestige as Cartter was with the reputational method. That is, Knudsen and Vaughan do not explain how publications in the three journals used in their study are of higher quality than publications in other journals. They refer to these periodicals as the "leading" journals but Shamblin argues that publications in these journals are, then, an indicator of prestige, not quality.

Shamblin also points out that the three journals used in the Knudsen and Vaughan study are controlled by persons from the most prestigious

departments. Thus, publications in these journals are an indirect indicator of membership in a professional clique but not of quality. That is, articles in *ASR*, *AJS*, and *SF* are merely quantifiable measures of prestige as measured by the subjective approach but not an independent measure of quality as the authors claim. Given this criticism, Shamblin cautions us to expect the Knudsen-Vaughan method to verify the findings of the reputational approach.

The apex of objective quality ranking methodologies of Ph.D. granting sociology departments was achieved by Glenn and Villemez (1970). These authors created the Glenn-Villemez Comprehensive Index (GVCI) as a more all-inclusive measure of productivity than the measure used by Knudsen and Vaughan. The GVCI covers contributions to 22 journals and all books reviewed in *ASR*. Weights were assigned to the journals based on a survey of a random sample of 250 associate professors and professors in Ph.D. granting departments listed in the *ASA Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology, 1969*. Since the book productivity measure is only an indicator of quantity, the authors devised a weighting system to estimate the quality of the department's books based on the scores of the journals in which members of the department published. This adjusted book score was used in the GVCI. Publications included in the GVCI cover the years 1965 through 1968.

The sample for this study consisted of the top 45 graduate departments as measured by the Knudsen-Vaughan Index. Unlike the Knudsen-Vaughan study, Glenn and Villemez consider only the productivity of faculty members in these departments. The sample is not restricted to Ph.D. granting departments but only two programs not granting the doctorate were included.

One goal of the study was to update the findings of Knudsen-Vaughan from their 1960-64 data base to the 1965-68 time period. Computing the Knudsen-Vaughan Index for 1965-68 data, the authors also find an elite of five departments but some changes within the ranks of the elite. Wisconsin had moved into this distinguished group, Berkeley dropped to sixth place, and Columbia moved from fifth to first place. A considerable amount of upward and downward mobility occurred among the other 40 departments. The authors speculate that since the productivity scores of these departments are relatively similar and since productivity in many of these departments is primarily limited to a few faculty members, that small changes in personnel could strongly influence productivity scores.

When using the more comprehensive GVCI as a measure of productivity, the authors found some discrepancies with the 1965-68 Knudsen-Vaughan Index rankings. The same departments were in the top five but their rank order was different. Based on the GVCI, Michigan raised from third to first, Wisconsin moved up three places to second, Columbia went from first to fourth, Chicago dropped from second to third, and Harvard moved from fourth to fifth (see Table 2). The impressive increase in Wisconsin's productivity was underscored by these findings. While Berkeley was ranked sixth with the GVCI and its productivity was well below that of fifth ranked Harvard, it was far above that of seventh ranked North Carolina. The authors conclude that Berkeley could, thus, be considered a "marginal" member of the elite.

The rankings of the other 40 departments in the sample differed considerably from the 1965-68 Knudsen-Vaughan measure, however. In 33 cases the rankings differed by at least three places.

Glenn and Villemez also rank departments on per person productivity. Using this measure the top five in rank order are: Harvard, New School, Chicago, Michigan, and Columbia (see Table 3). The productivity of Berkeley and Wisconsin are clearly inflated by the size of their faculties. New School, on the other hand, was rated thirty-fifth on the GVCI before controlling for productivity per person. The ranks of the other 40 institutions in the sample were not closely related when per person productivity was considered.

While the Glenn-Villemez study is not without limitations (see pp. 246-247 for a discussion of these limitations), it represents the most comprehensive and sophisticated approach to objective measures of the quality of graduate education in *TAS* up to the Sturgis and Clemente (1973) study which expands the GVCI. This improvement in quality rankings is primarily a result of the increased number of journals included and the journal weighting system devised for the GVCI.

In an article on the doctoral origins of editors of *ASR*, Yoels (1971) transiently slips in to the ranking game. Yoels finds what he calls considerable similarity between the rank order of the departmental origins of editors of *ASR* from 1955-65 and Wanderer's ranking of the doctoral origins of contributors to *ASR*. While Chicago, Harvard, and Columbia are in the top three in both studies, most of the other seven departments vary by at least three places.

Yoels also examines the percent of *ASR* editors during 1963-65 with doctoral origins at the top five departments according to the Cartter report. While Harvard, Chicago, and Columbia account for nearly 73 per cent of the editors of *ASR* at this time, Michigan contributed less than

three percent of the editors and Berkeley had none of its graduates engaged in this aspect of the sociological enterprise.

Oromaner (1972) ranked sociology departments on the number of citations their faulty received in the 1970 issues of *ASR* and the 1969-70 issues of *SF*. The sample included the 79 departments that granted at least one Ph.D. degree from 1965 through 1969. Sixty-six of these 79 departments had members who were cited in at least one *ASR* or *SF* article. At the height of influence in the profession were 10 departments which accounted for 40 percent of the author citations (see Table 2).

When departmental rank measured by number of citations per faculty member (see Table 3) was compared to the Roose-Andersen (1970) ratings, agreement was found only at the highest prestige levels. Harvard, Columbia, and Berkeley were ranked in the top five by Roose-Andersen and by the Oromaner method. Rankings outside the top four showed general agreement on the broad categories of Strong, Good, Adequate, Other, and Not Ranked but some wide discrepancies were found also. Nebraska and Santa Barbara were not ranked by Roose-Andersen but were eleventh and twelfth in number of citations per capita. Princeton, on the other hand, was rated as strong by Roose-Andersen but ranked thirty-fifth in citations per person. Thus, Oromaner's method of ranking departments by number of citations per person and the Roose-Andersen reputational approach agree only on a few elite departments.

Oromaner found the most often cited department was Wisconsin. When citations per person are analyzed, however, Wisconsin fell to ninth place. Harvard, on the other hand, was seventh in citations per department but first in per capita citations.

Solomon (1972) studied the relations of the Cartter and Roose-Andersen reputational ranking with the rankings of productivity used by Knudsen-Vaughan and Glenn-Villemez. He found that the Spearman rank-order correlations of the Roose-Andersen ratings with the GVCI and the Knudsen-Vaughan Index computed for 1965-68 were high and statistically significant. These findings support Lewis's (1968) contention of a close relationship between prestige ranking and objectively measured productivity. On the other hand, Solomon's findings cast doubt on the conclusions of Knudsen-Vaughan and Glenn-Villemez that these two measures of quality are not strongly related. This study supports the claim of Glenn and Villemez that the GVCI is more comprehensive and refined than the measure of Knudsen and Vaughan since the GVCI has a higher correlation with the Roose-Andersen ratings. The Glenn-Villemez per person productivity measure had a considerably lower correlation with the 1970 ACE study than did the GVCI, however.

Solomon (1972:14) concludes with a note of caution,

> There is some tendency to think of publication productivity versus departmental prestige as a dichotomous objective versus subjective relation. Consideration of this assumption leads one to realize that the "importance" attached to particular professional journals by a panel of "experts" . . . is in some respects as much a matter of subjective judgment as is the ranking of graduate departments with respect to prestige or quality. . . . it would seem that the primary advantage of weighted-publications measures as criteria of departmental quality is that they are more specific, rather than more "objective," than global prestige rankings are.

Clemente (1972) reviews ten measures of productivity used in sociology from 1950-1971 and illustrates how different conclusions regarding productivity can be drawn from these disparate measures. He goes on to argue for a consensus among sociologists for the use of the GVCI as the sole measure of productivity. Clemente (1972:7) states that the GVCI is

"composed of a broad range of journals and circumscribes most general sociological work as well as important specialty areas within the discipline. Another argument for its use is that it has a considerably wider scope than most previous indexes and yet is not electic." Clemente then marshals data to show that the GVCI is fair to all specialties within the discipline. Third, the GVCI arrives at a consensus of professional sociologists to base its weighting system upon. Finally, the Glenn-Villemez measure is flexible. That is, the GVCI can be expanded to include more books. Clemente (1972:8) concludes, "Hopefully, future research in the area will incorporate the GVCI or a similar measure, and then progress toward the real goal of the study of productivity - grounded sociological theory - will begin."

Larson, Petrowsky, and Vandiver (1972) studied departmental productivity based on the publications of their graduates. In order to construct a weighting system for journal publications, a survey of the chairmen of the top 20 graduate sociology departments as rated by Cartter was conducted asking them to identify the five journals in which they would prefer that their staff published. A rank ordering of 12 journals resulted. Each of these journals was then examined to obtain information on contributors.

Based on the productivity of its graduates listed in the American Sociological Association's *Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology, 1970*, Chicago was the most productive (see Table 2); it also graduated by far the largest number of productive sociologist at 99. In total productivity Chicago is followed by Columbia, Michigan, North Carolina, and Harvard. In terms of productivity per productive Ph.D., North Carolina is

first followed by Michigan, Ohio State, Wisconsin, and Chicago (see Table 3).

Statistically significant correlations are found between the Roose-Andersen measure of the prestige of the degree granting department and the productivity of both the sociologists as a group and and the departments.

Doering (1972) is primarily concerned with productivity across academic ranks but also sheds some light on departmental quality. The sample is limited to the top 26 departments as indicated Glenn and Villemez. Productivity is measured by book publication only. Doering found a moderate rank-order correlation between departmental rankings based on his measure and the overall productivity rating of Glenn-Villemez. The correlation between Doering's per person ranking and the per capita ratings of Glenn-Villemez is small, however.

This study ranks Berkeley first in book production followed by Chicago and Pennsylvania tied for second place, Columbia, and Wisconsin (see Table 2). When size of department is controlled for by calculating per person productivity, Harvard is first followed by Berkeley, Pennsylvania, Columbia, and NYU (see Table 3). Chicago drops to sixth in per person productivity and Wisconsin drops to eighteenth place. Interestingly, Michigan is not in the top seven on either of these scales.

Abbott (1972:14) states, "the most fundamental issue in the development of departmental ratings is whether or not subjective ratings of quality are equivalent to ratings based on objective measures of research productivity and other types of performance." In an attempt to answer this question he assesses the relationship between research productivity as measured by Glenn-Villemez, number of doctorates conferred during 1964-68,

and the size of the faculty with the Roose-Andersen ratings. Since these departmental characteristics account for only 57 percent of the unexplained variation in subjective ratings of departments, Abbott concludes that the reputational and objective methods are not equivalent.

Abbott goes on to raise the possibility that the primary referent for rating the prestige of a department is the image of the university itself. This hypothesis is confirmed. University prestige is found to account for 74 percent of the unexplained variance in departmental ratings, or more than do research productivity, doctorates granted, or size of faculty combined. Extending the analysis, Abbott (1972:15) states, "Taking departmental and university characteristics as the explanatory and control variables respectively, the multiple-partial coefficients of determination are .33 and .67, indicating that departmental ratings are more effectively accounted for by university variables than by departmental variables."

Abbott (1973) studied the mobility of 61 sociology departments in the U.S. from 1964 to 1969 using the Cartter and Roose-Andersen ratings. When analyzing movement between the categories of Distinguished, Strong, Good, Adequate, and Unrated it was found that 26 percent of the departments were upwardly mobile, 72 percent remained in the same category and one department (Washington, St. Louis) moved downward. All of the upwardly mobile departments except Vanderbilt moved up only one category. Upward mobility was most common for departments moving from the Good category to Strong. The top five departments and all but one of the Strong departments remained stable.

While the primary goal of Yoels (1973) is to assess the dissemination of Ph.D. dissertations in sociology, he also offers a rating of departments based on citations of dissertations. Yoels counted the number of

dissertations cited in *ASR* and *AJS* from 1955 through 1969. The four top schools were Chicago, Harvard, Michigan, and Columbia. These departments accounted for over 53 percent of all the citations. Thus, it appears that the higher the prestige of the department from which one obtained the Ph.D., the greater likelihood of one's dissertation being cited in the two most prestigious journals. As Yoels points out, however, Chicago, Columbia, and Harvard dominated the editorial staffs of *ASR* from 1948 to 1968. In addition, *AJS* is based at Chicago, and these four departments produce a disproportionate number of the Ph.D.s in sociology.

Another high point in the ratings of graduate sociology departments is Sturgis and Clemente (1973). This study measures departmental quality by assessing the productivity of the graduates of 50 major Ph.D. granting departments. The population for this study is all members of ASA who received the Ph.D. from American departments during the period 1950-1966. All departments granting less than ten Ph.D.s in this time period were excluded from the study. A modified form of the GVCI was used to measure productivity. The GVCI was expanded to cover all books received for review by *ASR*. Data on publication records of the 2,120 sociologists in the study were gathered for the period 1940-1970.

A standardization procedure was created to control for differences in the number of graduates and the professional longevity of graduates among departments. Berkeley, for example, has produced more Ph.D.s over a longer period than Brown or Vanderbilt. "The result is the average number of productivity points, articles, and books produced by the graduates from each department for every ten years beyond the Ph.D." (Sturgis and Clemente 1973:171).

Productivity ratings are provided on a number of measures: total standardized point ratios, article ratios, book ratios, percent of graduates ever published on the GVCI, and percent of graduates who published before receiving the Ph.D. Based on what the authors claim to be the best overall indicator of productivity, the total standardized point ratios, they conclude, " . . . there is no distinct top four or five departments as suggested by other rankings . . . " (Sturgis and Clemente 1973:174). That is, the authors found no distinct gaps in total productivity between departments when the standardization procedures are appiied. This finding, of course, does not agree with the results of Cartter, Knudsen-Vaughan, Glenn-Villemez, or Roose-Andersen.

The authors also conclude that their productivity measures do not correspond closely with the ranking based on reputational approaches (see Table 2). Nine of the top eleven according to Roose-Andersen received lower rankings on the total standardized point ratios. On the other hand, Oregon, Vanderbilt, Pennsylvania and Brown enjoyed much higher ratings in this study than in the Roose-Andersen report. Thus, using standardized scores for productivity of graduates of departments as a measure of quality, the results differ considerably from prior objective and subjective studies.

A new direction in the ranking of graduate sociology departments was proposed by Leonard and Schmitt (1974). They argue that participation in ASA meetings is a better measure of current department quality than the indicators used by others. It is also pointed out that " . . . institutional representation at the national meeting is much easier to determine, a recurrent event, and not as dependent upon past performance" (Leonard and Schmitt 1974:40).

The data base for this study consisted of the 1970, 1971, and 1972 ASA meetings final programs. The department of each participant was counted, except in the case of two or more authors of one paper from the same institution when the department was counted as one unit. Forty-seven graduate departments emerged as the most highly represented in the annual meetings. Size of faculty was controlled by a calculation of contributions per capita. Leonard and Schmitt found that these 47 departments had a relatively consistent pattern of participation in ASA meetings over this three year period.

After reviewing the correspondence between their method of assessing departmental quality and those of Glenn and Villemez (1970); the Glenn-Villemez computation of the Knudsen-Vaughan Index for 1965-68; the Larson, Petrowsky, and Vandiver (1972) method; and the Oromaner (1972) citation study, Leonard and Schmitt (1974:41) conclude " . . . departmental representation at ASA meetings, exhibits a moderate positive association with selected other indicators of the quality of American sociology departments."

Pfeffer, Salanick, and Leblebici (1974) were primarily interested in the distribution of National Science Foundation funds but also offer a potential measure for assessing departmental quality. After analyzing pattern of the institutional receipt of NSF funds, they conclude that while these funds are heavily concentrated among a few departments each year, there is less stability in funding distribution over time then might be expected. More specifically, "In three of the eight years, one-half or less of the top recipients were from the eight largest receivers of grants over the period" (Pfeffer, Salanick, and Leblebici 1974:197). The top eight sociology departments receiving NSF funding in 1971 were Yale, Johns

Hopkins, Columbia, Wisconsin, Michigan, Princeton, and Washington State University. Thus, another indicator of departmental quality is developed.

Solomon and Walters (1975) studied the causal linkages between prestige and scholarly productivity. The sample consists of the 38 departments each ranked by Glenn-Villemez, Cartter, and Roose-Andersen. Solomon and Walters use the prestige rankings of Cartter (ca. 1966) and Roose-Andersen (ca. 1969), and the productivity ratings of Knudsen-Vaughn (ca. 1960-64) and Glenn-Villemez (ca. 1965-68) to assess the causal relationship between department prestige and productivity with a longitudinal model. The authors conclude,

> . . . current prestige . . . is much more dependent upon previous prestige . . . than it is on previous productivity. ... The above evidence . . . tends to support the assertion that organization-set generated prestige orders tend not only to determine subsequent prestige orders and to have a dominant role in the making of significant allocative decisions within sociology, but furthermore, such evaluative bases tend toward particularistic evaluations and allocative decisions, rather than universalistic ones, in such self-perpetuating prestige orders (Solomon and Walters 1975:234-35).

Discussion

What do these studies or the quality of graduate education in sociology tell us? An overwhelming number of the studies which are based on total productivity of departments point to the existence of an elite among graduate sociology departments. These studies are generally in agreement with the Cartter and Roose-Andersen reputational studies on the top departments. As indicated in several of these studies, size of faculty and number of graduates can influence the visibility of a department and, of course, the number of publications to its credit. We must also note the concentration of editors among the prestigious journals from these same

elite departments. These gatekeepers of academic fame directly and indirectly influence the scope of the methodologies and research topics represented in these journals. That is, editors from the elite departments may prefer to publish papers which emphasize the methods or subject matter into which they and members of their professional clique have been socialized. As Shamblin (1970) and Solomon (1972) point out, the use of quantifiable measures of productivity based on a few prestigious journals may merely be an indirect indicator of prestige, not an independent measure of quality.

When per person productivity of faculty and graduates is used as a measure of quality of graduate education in sociology, the results are somewhat more inconsistent. While the elite identified by the reputational studies again dominate the top ten, a few newcomers such as Tulane, Brandeis, New School, Texas and Vanderbilt join the ranks of the most productive. Thus, when size of department is controlled, the rankings of the top departments change to a limited extent.

When considering these findings, we must reflect upon the suggestions of Lewis (1968), Abbott (1972), and Solomon and Walters (1975) Lewis (1968:131) concluded that " . . . it is mostly a department's prestige that has meaning on the wider academic scene." Abbott (1972) found status of the institution to be a better predictor of departmental prestige than the measures of productivity and size combined. Solomon and Walters (1975) found that the current prestige of a department is influenced more by previous prestige than by productivity. Thus, graduate departments of sociology appear to be part of a rather rigid stratification system, at least at the top, with institutional status and related previous

departmental prestige more important predictors of current prestige than is productivity.

The literature does contain several important exceptions to the pattern of at least general agreement between the objective studies and the reputational approach, however. After applying a standardization procedure controlling for the number of graduates from a department and their professional longevity, Sturgis and Clemente (1975) conclude there is no distinct elite among graduate sociology departments and that rankings based on their measure of productivity do not correspond well with the results of the reputational studies. In addition, Knudsen and Vaughan (1969) and Oromaner (1972) found little agreement between their productivity based rankings of the non-elite departments and those using the reputational method.

Implications for Further Research

It is our position that quality ranking can be of use to prospective graduate students, in maintaining a productive rivalry between departments, and as a reward for those upwardly mobile (i.e., increasingly productive) departments. Since *TAS* has not published such research since 1975 we advocate the need for a comprehensive ranking study of graduate departments in sociology to fill this gap. Assuming that adequate resources would be available, the study should be based on the Glenn-Villemez method with the refinements of Sturgis-Clemente included. This study should measure the productivity of both faculty and Ph.D. graduates. Such a direction in the research will allow longitudinal comparisons with the findings of Glenn-Villemez and Sturgis-Clemente. While we have no desire to re-enter an era in the sociology of sociology which is dominated by prestige

rankings, we support a comprehensive rating of graduate departments every three to five years in order to allow those interested to keep abreast of the ranking game.

TABLE 1

The American Council on Education Ratings of

Graduate Sociology Departments

Cartter (1966)[a]	Roose-Andersen (1970)[b]
1. UC, Berkeley	1. Harvard
2. Harvard	2. Michigan
3. Columbia	3. Chicago
4. Chicago	4. UC, Berkeley
5. Michigan	4. North Carolina
6. Wisconsin	4. Wisconsin
7. Cornell	7. Johns Hopkins
8. Princeton	7. Princeton
9. Minnesota	9. Columbia
10. North Carolina	9. Northwestern
	9. Yale

[a]Source: Lewis (1968)

[b]Source: Sturgis and Clemente (1973)

TABLE 2

Ratings of Graduate Sociology Departments by Total Productivity

Faculty

Knudsen-Vaughan (1969)	Glenn-Villemez (1970)	Oromaner (1972)	Doering (1972)
1. UC, Berkeley	1. Michigan	1. Wisconsin	1. UC, Berkeley
2. Harvard	2. Wisconsin	2. UC, Berkeley	2.5. Chicago
3. Chicago	3. Chicago	3. Columbia	2.5. Pennsylvania
4. Michigan	4. Columbia	4. North Carolina	4. Columbia
5. Columbia	5. Harvard	5. Michigan	5. Wisconsin
6. Princeton	6. UC, Berkeley	6. Chicago	6. Harvard
7. Wisconsin	7. North Carolina	7. Harvard	7. NYU
8. UCLA	8. Illinois	8. Yale	8. Michigan
9. Stanford	9. UCLA	9. Northwestern	9. Texas
10. Northwestern	10. Cornell	10. Johns Hopkins	10. University of Washington

Graduates

Wanderer (1966)	Knudsen-Vaughan (1969)	Larson, Petronsky, and Vandiver (1972)	Sturgis and Clemente (1973)
1. Chicago	1. Columbia	1. Chicago	1. UC, Berkeley
2. Columbia	2. Harvard	2. Columbia	2. Oregon
3. Harvard	3. Chicago	3. Michigan	3. Columbia
4. Michigan	4. Michigan	4. North Carolina	4. Vanderbilt
5. Ohio State	5. UC, Berkeley	5. Harvard	5. Princeton
6. University of Washington	6. Yale	6. Wisconsin	6. UCLA
7. Wisconsin	7. Northwestern	7. Ohio State	7. Pennsylvania
8. Yale	8. Cornell	8. UC, Berkeley	8. Harvard
9. UC (combined)	9. Ohio State	9. Minnesota	9. Michigan
10. North Carolina	10. Pennsylvania	10. Yale	10. Brown

TABLE 3

Ratings of Graduate Sociology Departments by Per Person Productivity

Faculty

Knudsen-Vaughan (1969)	Glenn-Villemez (1970)	Oromaner (1972)	Doering (1972)
1. Harvard	1. Harvard	1. Harvard	1. Harvard
2. Princeton	2. New School	2. Johns Hopkins	2. UC, Berkeley
3. Northwestern	3. Chicago	3. Columbia	3. Pennsylvania
4. UC, Berkeley	4. Michigan	4. UC, Berkeley	4. Columbia
5. Stanford	5. Columbia	5. North Carolina	5. NYU
6. Chicago	6. Princeton	6. Yale	6. Chicago
7. Michigan	7. Duke	7. Chicago	7. Johns Hopkins
8. UCLA	8. Northwestern	8. Northwestern	8. Cornell
9. Brandeis	8. Brandeis	9. Wisconsin	9. Texas
10. Tulane	10. Wisconsin	10. Michigan	10. Yale

Graduates

Knudsen-Vaughan (1969)	Larson, Petrowsky, and Vandiver (1972)
1. Columbia	1. North Carolina
2. Vanderbilt	2. Michigan
3. Texas	3. Ohio State
4. Harvard	4. Wisconsin
5. Pennsylvania	5. Chicago
6. UC, Berkeley	6. Columbia
7. Princeton	6. Harvard
8. Michigan	6. UC, Berkeley
9. Chicago	6. Yale
10. Cornell	6. Cornell

References

Abbott, Walter F.

1972 "University and Departmental Determinants of the Prestige of Sociology Departments." American Sociologist 7(9):14-15. November.

Abbott, Walter F.

1973 "Prestige Mobility of University Sociology Departments in the United States: 1964-1969." American Sociologist 8(1):38-41. February.

Cartter, Allan

1966 An Assessment of Quality of Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Clemente, Frank

1972 "Measuring Sociological Productivity: A Review and A Proposal." American Sociologist 7(9)(November):7-8.

Doering, Richard

1972 "Publish or Perish: Book Productivity and Academic Rank at Twenty-Six Elite Universities." American Sociologist 7(9)(November):11-13.

Glenn, Norval D. and Wayne Villemez

1970 "The Productivity of Sociologists at 45 American Universities." American Sociologist 5(3)(August):244-252.

Grimshaw, Allen

1975 "A Note from the Incoming Editor." American Sociologist (August):192.

Knudsen, Dean D. and Ted R. Vaughan

1969 "Quality in Graduate Education: a Re-evaluation of the Rankings of Sociology Departments in the Cartter Report." American Sociologist 4(1)(February):12-19.

Larson, Richard F., Marc L. Petrowsky, and Joseph [illegible]andiver

1972 "Journal Productivity of Ph.D. Sociologists." American Sociologist 7(9)(November):9-11.

Lawrence, Judith and Kenneth Green

1980 A Question of Quality: The Higher Education Ratings Game. AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Leonard, Wilbert M., II, and Raymond L. Schmitt

1974 "An American Sociological Association Meeting Index of Departmental 'Quality'." American Sociologist 9(1)(February): 40-43.

Lewis, Lionel S.

1968 "On Subjective and Objective Rankings of Sociology Departments." American Sociologist 3(2)(May):129-131.

Oromaner, Mark

1972 "The Structure of Influence in Contemporary Academic Sociology." American Sociologist 7(5)(May):11-13.

Parsons, Talcott

1965 "The American Sociologist: Editorial Statement." American Sociologist 1(November):2-3.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, Gerald R. Salancik, and Huseyin Leblebici

1974 "Stability and Concentration of National Science Foundation Funding in Sociology, 1964-1971." American Sociologist, 9(4)(November):194-198.

Roose, Kenneth and Charles Andersen

1970 A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Shamblin, Don H.

1970 "Prestige and the Sociology Establishment." American Sociologist 5(20)(May):154-156.

Solomon, Warren E.

1972 "Correlates of Prestige Ranking of Graduate Programs in Sociology." American Sociologist 7(5)(May):13-14.

Solomon, Warren E. and Alan Walters

1975 "The Relationship Between Productivity and Prestige of Graduate Sociology Departments: Fact or Artifact." American Sociologist 10(November):229-236.

Sturgis, Richard B. and Frank Clemente

1973 "The Productivity of Graduates of 50 Sociology Departments." American Sociologist 8(4)(November):169-180.

Wanderer, Jules J.

1966 "Academic Origins of Contributors to the American Sociologial Review, 1955-65." American Sociologist 1(5)(November):241-243.

Yoels, William C.

1971 "Destiny or Dynasty: Doctoral Origins and Appointment Patterns of Editors of the American Sociological Review, 1948-1968." American Sociologist 6(2)(May):134-139.

Yoels, William C.

1973 "The Fate of the Ph.D. Dissertation in Sociology: an Empirical Examination." American Sociologist 8(2)(May):87-89.